

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER CARDINAL, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOHN LUPO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-00272-JCS](#)

**ORDER REGARDING FAILURE TO
COMPLY WITH LOCAL RULES AND
PREVIOUS ORDER**

After other defendants filed separate motions for summary judgment, the Court previously ordered Defendants John Lupo and Kitchen Fantastic, Inc. to file a consolidated motion if they also intended to seek summary judgment. Dkt. 95. Instead, Lupo filed his own motion for summary judgment (dkt. 96), and Kitchen Fantastic filed a separate perfunctory notice of joinder (dkt. 99).

In addition to their opposition briefs (dkt. 101, 102) addressing the previously filed motions for summary judgment, Plaintiffs filed a separate document stating their objections to evidence (dkt. 106). That filing violates Civil Local Rule 7-3(a), which requires that “[a]ny evidentiary and procedural objections to [a] motion must be contained within the [opposition] brief or memorandum.” Civ. L.R. 7-3(a).

Both of these errors are of little consequence¹ and are excused in this instance. Nevertheless, both reflect a failure a failure to comply with an applicable order or rule, and both contribute to the increasingly unmanageable proliferation of filings in this action, which the Court’s previous order was intended to mitigate. The parties are admonished to comply with all applicable orders and rules going forward.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 16, 2019


JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge

¹ Combining Plaintiffs’ objections to evidence with either or both of their opposition briefs would not have exceeded the page limit for those briefs.